

COMMITTEE ON
**SCIENCE, SPACE, AND
TECHNOLOGY**
CHAIRMAN LAMAR SMITH



For Immediate Release
May 29, 2014

Media Contacts: Zachary Kurz
(202) 225-6371

**Statement of Chairman Lamar Smith (R-Texas)
Full Committee Hearing on Examining the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
Process**

Chairman Smith: The United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) recently released three working group reports on climate science – focused on physical sciences, impacts and adaptation, and mitigation. These documents make up the Fifth Assessment Report.

Similarly, the White House recently rolled out its National Climate Assessment, which takes a closer look at climate change and policy in the U.S.

Both the IPCC and the White House’s documents appear to be designed to spread fear and alarm and provide cover for previously determined government policies. The reports give the Obama Administration an excuse to control more of the lives of the American people.

The IPCC’s goal is an international climate treaty that redistributes wealth among nations. The Administration’s goal is to impose greenhouse gas regulations, which will stifle economic growth and lead to hundreds of thousands of fewer jobs each year.

On the heels of these catastrophic predictions, the President plans to announce next Monday his most costly climate regulations – new climate standards for power plants.

The Administration’s regulatory agenda will hit workers and families hard but have no discernable impact on global temperature. One analysis used IPCC assumptions and found that if the U.S. stopped all carbon dioxide emissions immediately, the ultimate impact on global temperature would only be 0.08 degrees Celsius by 2050.

Serious concerns have been raised about the IPCC, including lack of transparency in author and study selection, and inconsistent approaches to data quality, peer review, publication cut-off dates, and the cherry-picking of results.

Significantly, the scientists working on the underlying science for the IPCC defer to international politicians when they develop a so-called “Summary *for* Policy Makers.” This really amounts to a “Summary *by* Policy Makers.”

The document is disseminated ahead of the actual scientific assessment and provides biased information to newspapers and headline writers around the world, who gobble it up.

Dr. Robert Stavins of Harvard University, who served as a lead author for the IPCC, recently criticized this process as generating “irreconcilable conflicts of interest” that compromise scientific integrity. He

wrote that “any text that was considered inconsistent with their interests and positions in multilateral negotiations was treated as unacceptable.” The bias is there for all to see.

Following the 2007 assessment, key IPCC claims about the melting of Himalayan glaciers, the decline of crop yields, and the effects of sea level rise were found to be completely erroneous and derived from non-peer reviewed sources.

In 2010 the InterAcademy Council identified “significant shortcomings in each major step of IPCC’s assessment process.”

We all know that predictions are difficult and that the only certainty about projections far into the future is that they will be wrong. Incredibly, the IPCC predicts to the year 2100 and beyond.

The White House’s Climate Assessment implies that extreme weather, hurricanes, and severe storms are getting worse due to human-caused climate change. The President claims that droughts, wildfires, and floods “are now more frequent and more intense.” But the underlying science from the IPCC itself shows these claims are untrue. Yet the Administration keeps repeating them.

The President and others often claim that 97 percent of scientists believe that global warming is primarily driven by human activity. However, the study they cite has been debunked.

While the majority of scientists surveyed may think humans contribute something to climate change, and I would agree, only 1 percent said that humans cause most of the warming. So the President has misrepresented the study’s results.

We should focus on good science, rather than politically correct science. The facts should determine which climate policy options the U.S. and world considers.

The IPCC and White House reports acknowledge that the U.S. has achieved dramatic reductions in emissions. The White House’s National Climate Assessment recognized, for example, that “U.S. CO2 emissions from energy use...declined by around 9% between 2008 and 2012....”

U.S. contributions to global emissions are dwarfed by those of China, the world’s largest emitter of greenhouse gases. And China shows no signs of slowing down.

The Obama administration should stop trying to scare Americans and then impose costly, unnecessary regulations on them.

The President says there is no debate. Actually the debate has only just begun.

When assessing climate change, we need to make sure that findings are driven by science, not an alarmist, partisan agenda.

###